

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/053,346	01/18/2002	Bruce B. Fitts	RGP-0072 9834			
23413	7590 12/30/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER		
CANTOR COLBURN, LLP 55 GRIFFIN ROAD SOUTH BLOOMFIELD, CT 06002			LE, HOA VAN			
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			1752			

DATE MAILED: 12/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	,			
	10/053,346	FITTS ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Hoa V. Le	1752	_			
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1, after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repleted in the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ti by within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) da I will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fron te, cause the application to become ABANDONI	mely filed ys will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 (October 2004 and 08 November 2	<u>'004</u> .				
2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This	s action is non-final.					
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) See Continuation Sheet is/are pendidudad 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrays 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) (1-10), (11-16), (17-39), (40-60), (61) and/or election requirement.	awn from consideration.	<u>(90)</u> are subject to restriction				
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examin	er.					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ ac	cepted or b) objected to by the	Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documer 2. Certified copies of the priority documer 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documer * See the attached detailed Office action for a list 	nts have been received. Its have been received in Applicat prity documents have been receiv au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal D 6) Other:					

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims pending in the application are (1-10), (11-16), (17-39), (40-60), (61), (62), (63-75), (76), (77-89) and (90) .

This is in response to Papers filed on 12 October and 08 November 2004.

- A. On 28 December 2004 a telephone call was made to the Office of Ms. Mary Golota because she requests an interview. However, she was not at he desk. She may call in the Office anytime.
- B. The record shows that the broadest independent claim 1 was independently considered and searched only. Others are integrally considered and searched to those in claim 1.
- C. On 12 October 2004 applicants amend some independent claims and urge that they patentably different and distinct from the others.
- D. In view of the arguments, the restriction is made. Each of independent claims (1-10), (11-16), (17-39), (40-60), (61), (62), (63-75), (76), (77-89) and (90) will be independently considered and searched as urged on the record.
- E. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims (1-10), (11-16), (17-39), (40-60), (61), (62), (63-75), (77-89) and (90) drawn to a material, classified in class 429, class 26
 - II. Claim 76, drawn to a method, classified in class 264, subclass 5+. No search in these class and subclass was made on the record. Their embodiments were

Application/Control Number: 10/053,346

Art Unit: 1752

integrally picking up during the searches in class 429 only. If applicants elect this invention, the application may be transferred.

Inventions Group I and Group II are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case, the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process such as providing as second coating layer instead of using a molding process. Applicants should show or provide evidence to the contrary. In the absence of convincing, the restriction on the record would not be removed.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired the separate status and searches in the art and can be supported the separate patents as divided by applicants. Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper. Applicant should show or provide evidence to the contrary. In the absence of convincing evidence, the restriction would not be removed.

However any process claim is permitted to be rejoined with an elected material claimed invention provided (a) that the material claimed invention is allowable and (b) the process claim must be contained all of the limitations of the allowable material claim in accordance with the authority stated in In re Ochiai, 37 USPQ2d 1127 or In re Brouwer, 37 USPQ2d 1663 and MPEP 821.04.

Application/Control Number: 10/053,346

Art Unit: 1752

F. The independent groups of material claims (1-10), (11-16), (17-39), (40-60), (61), (62), (63-75), (77-89) and (90) are not considered patentably different or distinct invention since they share the general shape with some species variant. Therefore, no restriction among them is made. Should applicants disagree, show or urge otherwise in the next response to this Office action in order for it to be considered timely, a restriction will be made for the record as shown or urged.

Claims (1-10), (11-16), (17-39), (40-60), (61), (62), (63-75), (77-89) and (90) are generic to a plurality of disclosed patentably distinct species comprising:

species number 1 with respect to the group of claims (1-10), species number 2 with respect to the group of claims (11-16), species number 3 with respect to the group of claims (17-39), species number 4 with respect to the group of claims (40-60), species number 5 with respect to the group of claim (61), species number 6 with respect to the group of claim (62), species number 7 with respect to the group of claims (63-75), species number 8 with respect to the group of claims (77-89), species number 9 with respect to the group of claims (90),

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species number such as 1 or 2, even though this requirement is traversed.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the

Art Unit: 1752

examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

- G. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include full elections and requirements to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).
- H. Other issues have not been considered until full and proper elections and requirements are made and resolved.
- I. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hoa V. Le whose telephone number is 571-272-1332.

 The examiner can normally be reached from 6:30 AM to 4:30 PM on Monday though Thursday and about the same time of most Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cynthia Kelly can be reached on 571-272-1526.

Applicants may file a paper by (1) fax with a central facsimile receiving number 703-872-9306. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

Application/Control Number: 10/053,346

Art Unit: 1752

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Hoa V. Le Primary Examiner Art Unit 1752

HVL 28 December 2004

HOA VAN LE

Page 6